



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Roger Towersey: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the  
Secretary of State for Education**

**March 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	20

## **Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Roger Towersey
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1761909
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	6 November 1988
<b>TRA reference:</b>	25522
<b>Date of determination:</b>	2 March 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	Ditton Park Academy, Slough

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 2 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Roger Towersey.

The panel members were Mr Francis Murphy (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Anila Rai (lay panellist) and Mrs Helen Hynd (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lara Small of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Towersey that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Towersey provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Jack Ashford of Capsticks LLP, Mr Towersey or any representative for Mr Towersey.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Towersey was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Ditton Park Academy ('the School'):

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with a former pupil of the School, Pupil A, in that:
  - (a) Between around October 2023 and April 2024 he sent messages to Pupil A via social media when there was no professional reason to do so;
  - (b) On one or more occasions between 28 March 2024 and 10 April 2024 he sent money to Pupil A.
2. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil B and/or Child C in that:
  - a) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 he allowed Pupil B and/or Child C to access the School site outside of school hours;
  - b) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 he was alone with Pupil B and/or Child C when there was no professional reason to be;
  - c) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 he purchased food for Pupil B and/or Child C; and/or
  - d) He instructed Pupil B not to tell anyone that he was allowing him on to the School site outside of school hours.
3. His actions as may be found proven at 2(d) above were dishonest and/or lacked integrity.
4. He failed to take any or any appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil B and/or Pupil C in that:
  - a) He did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C were attending the School site outside of school hours;
  - b) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 he left Pupil B and/or Child C unattended on the School site; and/or
  - c) He did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C had reported to him that they were hungry and/or cold.

Mr Towersey admitted allegations 1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 3, 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c), as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025 and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

In advance of the meeting, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 30

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 31 to 38

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 39 to 224

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 225 to 229

14 clips of CCTV evidence were also provided separately.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and had watched the CCTV clips, in advance of the meeting.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020, (the “Procedures”).

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025.

### **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

On 1 July 2018, Mr Towersey commenced employment at Ditton Park Academy (‘the School’).

In or around early 2024, Mr Towersey allegedly messaged a former pupil, Pupil A, on social media and sent her money.

On 23 April 2024, the School held an investigation meeting with Mr Towersey in relation to concerns in respect of Pupil A.

Between July 2024 and January 2025, Mr Towersey allegedly allowed Pupil B and/or Child C to attend the School site on weekends outside of school hours. He also allegedly bought them food and left them unattended on occasions.

On 30 April 2025, the matter was referred to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

### **1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with a former pupil of the School, Pupil A, in that:**

#### **(a) Between around October 2023 and April 2024 you sent messages to Pupil A via social media when there was no professional reason to do so;**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted to allegation 1(a).

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel had sight of screenshots of messages Mr Towersey had sent to Pupil A on TikTok using his TikTok username '[REDACTED]', and the panel noted in particular the following messages from Mr Towersey:

- *“Don’t be getting anything too nice, I don’t want to be responsible for either of you pulling and accidentally getting pregnant. Stay out of Victoria Secret aswell [laughing emoji] Only joking have a good time while I’m bloody working. Its all I do, eat, sleep, shit and work. Adulting is not fun. [angry emoji].”*
- *“what sports do you do?”, to which Pupil A replied “[REDACTED]. All sorts”, and Mr Towersey messaged in response “Wow, No wonder you stay in such good shape.”*
- *“All done. You okay anyways?”*

- *“Oh I see. Getting a bit bored now then. I am a bit bored too now tbf. Don’t you go out with your boyfriend or mates?”*
- *“Are you two going shopping or out on the lash? [laughing emoji]”*
- *“Be careful they will wonder where all the ££ came from. They will think your dealing or doing only fans. [laughing emoji]”*

The panel considered the notes of the School’s investigation meeting with Pupil A on 24 April 2024, in which Pupil A told Individual A, the Investigating Officer, that just before her 18<sup>th</sup> birthday Mr Towersey started messaging her on TikTok. She stated that he messaged her to say *“happy easter”*, asked her about her plans and that they spoke about money, college and shopping.

The panel considered the notes of the School’s investigation meeting with Mr Towersey on 23 April 2024 in which Mr Towersey admitted that he had started communicating with Pupil A on TikTok. In this meeting, Mr Towersey stated that he did this because he wanted to check Pupil A had someone to talk to and that he *“knew it was beyond (his) remit.”* In this meeting, Mr Towersey stated that *“in hindsight (he) forgot that she was an ex-student and was just a normal person – (and that) the language he used is not what he would use in a professional setting and (he) now knows this to be wrong.”*

The panel found allegation 1(a) proven.

**(b) On one or more occasions between 28 March 2024 and 10 April 2024 you sent money to Pupil A.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted to allegation 1(b).

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel had sight of screenshots of Pupil A’s bank account. The panel noted the following transactions from ‘Mr R Towersey’:

- on 28 March 2024, Mr Towersey sent Pupil A £200, in two separate £100 transactions both with the reference ‘Happy Easter’.
- on 3 April 2024, Mr Towersey sent Pupil A £100, with the reference ‘X’.
- on 8 April 2024 Mr Towersey sent Pupil A £20, with the reference ‘Mr T’.
- on 9 April 2024 Mr Towersey sent Pupil A £100 with the reference ‘Mr T’.
- on 10 April 2024 he sent her £80, with the reference ‘RTO’.

The panel considered the screenshots of messages Mr Towersey sent Pupil A on social media. The panel noted that Pupil A asked to borrow £4, and Mr Towersey replied *“Hey You. sorry for the late reply. yea sure. i’ll send you 20 now.”* The panel noted that Pupil A messaged Mr Towersey stating *“Hey I am going out with my family today is it okay if I have some money please [praying emoji]”* and Mr Towersey replied with *“Blimey [Pupil A]! you spend fast! Okay but last time for this month.”*

The panel considered the notes of the School’s investigation meeting with Pupil A on 24 April 2024, in which Pupil A told the Investigating Officer that she had received money from Mr Towersey roughly around four times, which came to around £500 in total.

The panel considered the notes of the School’s investigation meeting with Mr Towersey on 23 April 2024 in which Mr Towersey admitted that he had given money to Pupil A by online bank transfer, and that the amounts of money totalled £500.

The panel considered the written statement that Mr Towersey provided to the School at his investigation meeting on 23 April 2024, in which Mr Towersey stated *“I offered to help her out with money if she needed. As soon as I offered, I realised it was a stupid thing to do.”*

The panel found allegation 1(b) proven.

**2. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil B and/or Child C in that:**

- a) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 you allowed Pupil B and/or Child C to access the School site outside of school hours;**
- b) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 you were alone with Pupil B and/or Child C when there was no professional reason to be;**
- c) On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 you purchased food for Pupil B and/or Child C; and/or**
- d) You instructed Pupil B not to tell anyone that you were allowing him on to the School site outside of school hours.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted to allegations 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d).

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered the CCTV log which described what could be seen in each of the CCTV video clips. The panel also had sight of these CCTV video clips.

The panel considered CCTV video clip number 1, dated 23 November 2024, which showed Mr Towersey in the SEN breakout room with Pupil B and Child C. One of the pupils can be seen eating a chocolate bar. The panel noted that 23 November 2024 was a Saturday.

The panel considered CCTV video clip number 3, dated 24 November 2024, which showed Mr Towersey in the SEN breakout room with Pupil B and Child C, and one of the pupils can be seen eating a corn on the cob, and later Mr Towersey hands them a bag of food. The panel noted that 24 November 2024 was a Sunday.

The panel considered CCTV video clip number 6, dated 8 December 2024, which showed Mr Towersey in the bin store with Pupil B and Child C. Mr Towersey is then seen walking through the car park with both pupils. The panel noted that 8 December 2024 was a Sunday.

The panel considered the CCTV clips dated 12 January 2025, and noted that Pupil B and Child C could be seen in the corridors and in the SEN breakout room. The panel noted that 12 January 2025 was a Sunday.

The panel considered the notes of a meeting with Pupil B on 3 February 2025. The panel noted that Pupil B shared during the meeting that Mr Towersey would let them into the School and into the SEN area where they would spend time and play football. He further stated that Mr Towersey bought them drinks and snacks, such as chocolate bars. Pupil B stated that on 12 January 2025, he was on the School site for around "2/3 hours". When asked how many times Pupil B had been on site outside of School hours, Pupil B replied "*lots of times...every weekend last year...maybe 100 times...RTO didn't tell us that we should not come here.*"

The panel considered the written statement of Mr Towersey, who stated that Pupil B and Child C first came on to site on 8 June 2024 uninvited. Mr Towersey stated that they did not then come again for a couple of weeks, but did come for the last few weekends of the summer term in July 2024. He stated that he did not see them come onto site as he was doing duties such as litter picking and emptying bins. Mr Towersey stated that Pupil B and Child C did not come to the site over summer, but did again as of September 2024, initially just to use the sports pitch.

In his written statement, Mr Towersey stated that Pupil B and Child C were telling him personal information and he began to feel sorry for them. He stated that the pupils then started asking for snacks and he would give them whatever he had in his bag, but they then began asking him for specific food items. Mr Towersey stated that one weekend he ordered McDonald's and the pupils asked that he order for them too, and that "*ordering*

*food then became a regular thing on Just Eat” and Pupil B and Child C would choose what they wanted to eat, by browsing on Mr Towersey’s personal phone.*

The panel noted that in the School’s meeting with Pupil B on 3 February 2025, Pupil B stated *“we ask sir to buy snacks for us. He normally says yes but sometimes he doesn’t know we are coming.”*

The panel noted that in his written statement, Mr Towersey stated *“I now understand that by giving them food actually led to encouraging them (to) continue to come. Something I was trying to avoid.”*

In his written statement, Mr Towersey confirmed he did not report the pupils’ presence on the School site when they started to come back in July 2024. Mr Towersey stated that *“throughout the time, including on the weekend of the 19<sup>th</sup> January, I mentioned on numerous occasions that the boys should not come to site, I was not allowed to let them be on site and (that) I would lose my job.”*

The panel noted in the notes of the meeting with Pupil B on 3 February 2025, that Pupil B stated that Mr Towersey *“said don’t tell anyone as students are not allowed to come”* and that *“he said that (he) can lose (his) job if someone know(s) that [Pupil B] is coming here.”*

Based on the evidence available to it, the panel concluded that it was more likely than not that the events described in allegations 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d) did occur, and the panel considered that each of these actions by Mr Towersey demonstrated a failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil B and/or Child C.

The panel found allegation 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d) proven.

### **3. Your actions as may be found proven at 2(d) above were dishonest and/or lacked integrity.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted to allegation 3.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, it stated *“The Teacher admits that he knew Pupil B and Child C were not allowed onsite outside of school hours...he accepts that, part of his purpose in telling Pupil B not to tell anyone else, was to conceal/hide the fact that he was permitting this in circumstances where he knew it was not allowed. The Teacher admits that his conduct in instructing Pupil B not to tell anyone that he was allowing him on the School site, outside of school hours, was dishonest.”*

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered whether Mr Towersey had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*.

The panel was mindful that professionals are not expected to be “*paragons of virtue*”. However, the panel was satisfied that Mr Towersey had failed to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher by deliberately telling Pupil B to not tell anyone that he was allowing him onto the School site outside of school hours.

The panel was therefore satisfied that Mr Towersey’s conduct, as found proven, lacked integrity.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Towersey had acted dishonestly and, in doing so, had regard to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Mr Towersey’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel noted that in the minutes of the School investigation meeting with Mr Towersey on 6 February 2025, Mr Towersey admitted that he had said to Pupil B at the time “*you know you are not allowed to be here, if you are seen on the cameras I will be fired.*” The panel noted that in Mr Towersey’s written disciplinary hearing statement, he stated “*throughout the time, including on the weekend of the 19<sup>th</sup> January, I mentioned on numerous occasions that the boys should not come to site, I was not allowed to let them be on site and I would lose my job*”.

The panel concluded that Mr Towersey’s conduct as found proven at allegation 2(d) was deliberate as he knew that his conduct was wrong. The panel was therefore satisfied that Mr Towersey had acted dishonestly by instructing Pupil B not to tell anyone that he was allowing him on to the School site outside of school hours, and his conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people.

The panel found allegation 3 proven.

**4. You failed to take any or any appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil B and/or Pupil C in that:**

- a. You did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C were attending the School site outside of school hours;**
- b. On one or more occasions between July 2024 and 19 January 2025 you left Pupil B and/or Child C unattended on the School site; and/or**
- c. You did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C had reported to you that they were hungry and/or cold.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted to allegation 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c).

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered the contents of Mr Towersey's written disciplinary hearing statement, in which he stated that the first time when the boys attended the School site outside of school hours was on 8 June 2024 and that he immediately reported their presence onsite, and the matter was passed to Individual A to deal with. The panel could see no corroborating evidence that Mr Towersey had reported Pupil B and/or Child C's attendance on the School site outside of hours to the School at any time, and the panel was therefore not convinced on the balance of probability that this had actually occurred.

The panel noted that in his written disciplinary hearing statement, Mr Towersey stated that after the boys kept coming back to the School site outside of school hours from July 2024 onwards that *"I should have reported the boy's presence onsite again and let the school deal with it, but I did not.... This was a breach of procedure and policy. I should have reported every occasion they came to site."*

The panel noted that in his written disciplinary hearing statement, Mr Towersey stated that *"I for some reason just walked away and rather than insist they leave I just left them."* The panel considered that this indicated an admission that Mr Towersey had left Pupil B and/or Child B unattended and unsupervised on the School site on one or more occasions.

The panel noted that in the notes of the School's meeting with Pupil B on 3 February 2025, Pupil B stated that *"he doesn't spend too much time (with us) it's just two of us. He has to do other work."*

The panel noted that in more than one of the CCTV footage clips, Pupil B and/or Child C could be seen on the School site unsupervised and unattended.

The panel noted that it had not seen any contemporaneous record within the bundle of Mr Towersey reporting to the School that Pupil B and/or Child C had reported to him that they were cold and/or hungry at the time.

The panel noted that in the notes of the School's investigation meeting with Mr Towersey on 6 February 2025, Mr Towersey was asked *"why did you not log a concern on CPOMS re his hunger?"* and Mr Towersey replied *"I don't know if I was concerned about his hunger."* The panel considered this to be an admission by Mr Towersey that he did not log a concern on CPOMS that Pupil B had reported he was hungry at the time.

The panel noted that in Mr Towersey's written disciplinary hearing statement, he wrote *"they started asked for snacks as they were hungry after playing football and I gave them whatever snacks I had in my bag...."* and that *"I had purchased [Pupil B] his lunch as well on a number of occasions as he said he had no money on his account and said he was hungry."*

The panel concluded that based on the above, it was more likely than not that Mr Towersey did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C were attending the School site out of school hours, that he left them unattended on the School site on more than one occasion and that Mr Towersey did not notify anyone that Pupil B and/or Child C had reported to him that they were hungry and/or cold. The panel considered that this demonstrated that Mr Towersey had failed to take any action or any appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil B and/or Child C.

The panel found allegations 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) proven.

## **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute**

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Towersey on 23 November 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Mr Towersey on 6 September 2025 in which he admitted and accepted that in respect of his admitted conduct at allegations 1-4 above that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Towersey, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Towersey was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel considered whether Mr Towersey's actions as found proven in allegations 1-4 breached the School's policies and procedures. The panel noted that Mr Towersey had completed his annual mandatory training, including on 'Child Protection in Education'. The panel considered that Mr Towersey had breached the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy and the School's Staff Code of Conduct in the way that he behaved as proven in allegations 1-4.

The panel also considered whether Mr Towersey's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant. The panel considered that Mr Towersey's dishonesty (as found proven under allegation 3) was serious because he was encouraging Pupil B to withhold the truth from the School and that led to a safeguarding risk for that pupil.

The panel noted that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) took place outside the education setting. Despite this, the panel found that Mr Towersey's conduct was relevant to his position as a teacher in that he had communicated with a former pupil via social media (TikTok) and sent them money on more than one occasion, totalling £500.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Towersey amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Towersey was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Towersey's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Towersey's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Towersey was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that serious dishonesty was relevant.

The findings of misconduct as found proven by the panel are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Towersey's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Towersey's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

The panel was particularly concerned by Mr Towersey's conduct as found proven, because it was a pattern of behaviour which occurred over a sustained period of time and was not a one-off incident. The panel concluded that Mr Towersey's conduct was clearly unprofessional, it breached the professional boundaries and standards expected of a teacher and suggested attempts by Mr Towersey to gain a level of familiarity with pupils which was not appropriate for a teacher-pupil relationship. The panel also noted that the amounts of money that Mr Towersey was spending on pupils (for example, £500 on Pupil A and, by his own admission, around £1,000 in fast food for Pupil B and/or Child C), whom he knew to be vulnerable, was highly inappropriate.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Towersey's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Towersey, which involved messaging Pupil A on social media and sending her money, allowing Pupil B and/or Child C onto the School site outside of school hours, being alone with them, and buying them food and failing to notify anyone that this was the case or that the pupils reported they were hungry and cold, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Towersey were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Towersey was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Towersey in the profession. The panel did not see any evidence of Mr Towersey's abilities as an educator nor that he had made a particularly valuable contribution to the profession. The panel considered that Mr Towersey's behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Towersey.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
  - encouraging others to break rules.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Towersey's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence that Mr Towersey was acting under extreme duress.

The panel did not have any evidence that Mr Towersey demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it that the incident was out of character and noted that it was conduct that occurred over a sustained period and was not a one-off incident.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Towersey of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Towersey. The panel's findings against Mr Towersey, which involved inappropriate messages to Pupil A on social media and sending her money, allowing Pupil B and Child C onto the School site outside of school hours, being alone with them, and buying them food and failing to notify anyone that this was the case or that the pupils reported they were hungry and cold, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

One of these includes:

- serious dishonesty.

As explained above, the panel considered that Mr Towersey's dishonesty as found proven under allegation 3 was serious because he was encouraging Pupil B to withhold the truth from the School and that led to a safeguarding risk for that pupil over a lengthy period of time.

The panel considered whether Mr Towersey had demonstrated remorse for his past conduct and/or insight into his actions to prevent the risk of future repetition.

The panel considered the contents of Mr Towersey's written statement given at his disciplinary hearing in which he stated:

- *"I hope with all my heart you have been able to determine that my motivations were not nefarious or sinister, I thought my actions were having a net benefit to [Pupil B], to his well being. His confidence and emotional wellbeing had improved and he was performing better academically. This was a reason I thought I was doing something that was in the grand scheme of things reasonable, even though*

*risking my job he was doing well. I did not consider that [Pupil B] was at risk of neglect.”*

- *“I now understand that giving them food actually led to encouraging them continue to come. Something I was trying to avoid.”*
- *“I have demonstrated good character during my time at Ditton Park in my deference and respect to my colleagues and superiors, in my commitment to my duties and students and through modelling good character to my students through all my interactions with them. I believe this is why I am respected and trusted by my students and why it does truly hurt that I have let them down.”*
- *“In order to do whatever is needed to help with reducing impact I am willing to resign effective immediately....I will do whatever you think is right for the students.”*
- *“I have made mistakes because I am over caring and make unprofessional decisions when presented with certain emotionally charged situations”.*
- *“I also didn’t act in an open and honest way when I failed to continue to report the boys coming to site in July...I felt trapped, I had already made a decision that could lead to the end of my career and no way out other than to continue to support the young people.”*

The panel carefully considered this. Whilst the panel noted that Mr Towersey demonstrated remorse for his past conduct in the above statements, the panel was not convinced that he had sufficient insight into how his behaviour had affected Pupil A and/or Pupil B. The panel was concerned by Mr Towersey’s misunderstanding of his professional boundaries and his role as a teacher, in that he seemed to believe that he personally was obliged to *“support the young people”* rather than it being a relevant matter for the School to deal with. The panel considered that Mr Towersey’s comments indicated a lack of understanding of safeguarding and a lack of awareness of how his actions were inherently wrong and not in the best interests of the pupils, as he refers in his statement of having needed to *“continue to support the young people”*. The panel also noted that Mr Towersey referred to receiving a *“small message of support from a student (which) really helped”* during his suspension, again demonstrating a lack of understanding of his professional boundaries. The panel therefore concluded that there was a risk of future repetition.

Taking all of this into consideration, the panel decided on balance that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel considered that a review period of four years would be appropriate in this case because it would offer Mr Towersey a sufficient period of time to reflect on how his actions were not in the best

interests of the pupils, and would give him additional time to demonstrate ways to avoid repetition of such events in future.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Roger Towersey should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 4 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Towersey is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Towersey involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Towersey fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of failing to maintain professional boundaries with pupils, failing to ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard pupils and dishonesty.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Towersey, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Towersey, which involved messaging Pupil A on social media and sending her money, allowing Pupil B and/or Child C onto the School site outside of school hours, being alone with them, and buying them food and failing to notify anyone that this was the case or that the pupils reported they were hungry and cold, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel carefully considered this. Whilst the panel noted that Mr Towersey demonstrated remorse for his past conduct in the above statements, the panel was not convinced that he had sufficient insight into how his behaviour had affected Pupil A and/or Pupil B. The panel was concerned by Mr Towersey’s misunderstanding of his professional boundaries and his role as a teacher, in that he seemed to believe that he personally was obliged to “*support the young people*” rather than it being a relevant matter for the School to deal with. The panel considered that Mr Towersey’s comments indicated a lack of understanding of safeguarding and a lack of awareness of how his actions were inherently wrong and not in the best interests of the pupils, as he refers in his statement of having needed to “*continue to support the young people*”. The panel also noted that Mr Towersey referred to receiving a “*small message of support from a student (which)*”

*really helped*” during his suspension, again demonstrating a lack of understanding of his professional boundaries. The panel therefore concluded that there was a risk of future repetition. “

In my judgement, the lack of insight shown by Mr Towersey means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Towersey were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the findings of breaching professional boundaries and of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such findings have on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Towersey himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel did not have any evidence that Mr Towersey demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it that the incident was out of character and noted that it was conduct that occurred over a sustained period and was not a one-off incident.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Towersey from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the seriousness of the misconduct found proven. The panel has said:

“The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Towersey. The panel's findings against Mr Towersey, which involved inappropriate messages to Pupil A on social media and sending her money, allowing Pupil B and Child C onto the School site outside of school hours, being alone with them, and buying them food and failing to notify anyone that this was the case or that the pupils reported they were hungry and cold, was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's finding as to Mr Towersey's lack of insight and the panel's concerns that Mr Towersey's conduct “was a pattern of behaviour which occurred over a sustained period of time and was not a one-off incident.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Towersey has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 4-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

“The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

One of these includes:

- serious dishonesty.

As explained above, the panel considered that Mr Towersey's dishonesty as found proven under allegation 3 was serious because he was encouraging Pupil B to withhold the truth from the School and that led to a safeguarding risk for that pupil over a lengthy period of time.”

I have also considered the panel's comment concerning the lack of insight shown by Mr Towersey and the consequent risk of future repetition.

I have considered whether a 4-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious and sustained nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of insight and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 4-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Roger Towersey is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 6 March 2030, 4 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Towersey remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Towersey has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 3 March 2026**

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.